



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,337	05/23/2006	Reinhold Braam	2003P15404WOUS	3216
22116	7590	12/05/2008	EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			SARWAR, BABAR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/580,337	BRAAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BABAR SARWAR	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 6-18 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 6-18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 05/23/2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims **1-5** have been cancelled.
2. Claims **6-18** are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims **6-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elizabeth et al. ("A Review of Current Routing Protocols for Ad Hoc Mobile Wireless Networks" IEEE, April 1999) in view of Applicant Admission of Prior Art, hereinafter referenced as Eli and AAPA.

Consider **claim 16**, Eli teaches a decentralized mobile wireless network system (figs. 3a-3b, Ad Hoc mobile wireless network). Eli further discloses a network service that is available to a service requester (figs. 3a, elements N1-N8, where N1 being a source node or the service requester), a plurality of IP routers (figs. 3a-3b, elements N1-N8) each having a routing table (Page 48 Para 8), a service discovery request message that includes a first routing indicator and information pertaining to the service, wherein the request message is multicast from the requester, thereby flooding the network (Page 48 Para 6-8, fig. 3a, where Eli teaches an RREQ (route request/ service discovery request) being multicast across the network). Eli teaches that each router

receives the request message and updates the routing table with routing information pertaining to the received request message when the request message includes the first routing indicator (Page 48, Para 6-8, fig. 3a, where Eli discloses intermediate nodes updating their routing tables), and a service discovery reply that includes a second routing indicator (fig. 3b, where Eli discloses a destination node N8, an RREP (a route reply), and intermediate nodes updating their routing tables) wherein the reply is sent by a provider that receives the request message and that provides the service (fig. 3a-3b, element N8, the destination node), the reply is sent in direct response to the service discover request message, wherein the network is not flooded with the reply message, and wherein the reply message is received by a portion of the plurality of IP routers and the routing table at the portion of routers is updated with information pertaining to the corresponding reply message when the reply message includes the second routing indicator, and wherein a connection between the requester and the provider providing the service is establishing in the network (Page 48 Para 6-8, fig. 3b, where Eli teaches the destination node unicasting (not multicasting/broadcasting/flooding i.e. reducing the overhead) RREP to the source node and intermediate nodes updating their routing tables).

Eli fails to specifically disclose a plurality of service providers receiving the request message. AAPA teaches disclose a plurality of service providers receiving the request message (Fig. 4 element 3).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Eli by specifically providing a plurality of service

providers receiving the request message, as taught by AAPA, for the purpose of reducing the overhead issue by uncasting RREP to the source node as discussed in Para 0004.

Consider **claim 17**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 16). In addition, Eli discloses that the portion of the routers is determined via a route/path determined from multicasting (Page 48 Para 6-7, fig. 3a).

Consider **claim 18**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 16). In addition, Eli discloses that the request and reply messages are in accordance to an Ad hoc On Demand Distance Vector Routing Protocol or a Dynamic Source Routing Protocol for Mobile Ad hoc Networks (Page 48 Para 5, figs. 3a-3b).

Claim 6, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 16.

Consider **claim 7**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 6). In addition, Eli discloses that the request message include an element of a route request of a service provider (Page 48 Para 6-7, fig. 3a).

Consider **claim 8**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 7). In addition, Eli discloses that the reply message includes all the elements of a route reply of the service requester (Page 48 Para 8, fig. 3b).

Claim 9, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 18.

Consider **claim 10**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 9). In addition, Eli discloses that the protocol of the request and reply message is extended such that on receipt of the expanded messages the routing tables are updated with routing information (Page 48 Para 8, figs. 3a-3b).

Claim 11, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 16.

Consider **claim 12**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 11). In addition, Eli discloses that the request message includes an indicator indicating to the receiving routers to add routing information pertaining to the received request message (Para 5-8, fig. 3a, where Eli teaches that nodes update their routing tables).

Consider **claim 13**, Eli and AAPA teach everything claimed as implemented above (see claim 11). In addition, Eli discloses that the reply message includes an indicator indicating to the receiving routers to add routing information pertaining to the received reply message (Page 48 Para 8, fig. 3b, where Eli teaches that nodes update their routing tables).

Claim 14, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 18.

Claim 15, as analyzed with respect to the limitations as discussed in claim 17.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BABAR SARWAR whose telephone number is (571)270-5584. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY TO FRIDAY 09:30 A.M -05:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NICK CORSARO can be reached on (571)272-7876. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2617

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. S./

/B. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/NICK CORSARO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617